

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060007-7

H. R. 17256

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060007-7

E 6466

10 percent a year in the last decade. For 1973, it was as high as 12.3 percent.

Free China is confidently building for the future, with the sure knowledge that there are still nations and peoples who value freedom and the dignity of the individual. Free China knows that it can continue to find support among those nations and peoples.

Speaking recently to the Chinese people, President Chiang Kai-shek voiced the nation's optimism in these words:

The world understands that to strengthen both the Government and people of the Republic of China is to increase the strength of the free world, and the free world would not be that strength in any way to be diminished.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent discussions involving the role our Government is said to have played in the internal affairs of the Chilean nation has raised serious questions about the workings of our foreign intelligence gathering agencies.

John Farmer of the Philadelphia Bulletin has written an analysis of the Chilean incident which contributes to a better understanding of the problems which exist when intelligence activities move beyond gathering information to actually becoming involved in the domestic affairs of another nation. The allegations which have been leveled against certain agencies of our Government provide a strong case for more effective and aggressive congressional oversight in this strategic policy area.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

WHITE HOUSE "40 COMMITTEE" FED OVERTHROW OF ALLENDE (By John J. Farmer)

WASHINGTON.—On a warm Saturday morning, June 27, 1970, Henry Kissinger, addressing the most secret committee of the United States government, laid down in highly personal terms what was to become official American policy toward Chile.

"I don't see why we should have to stand by and let a country go Communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people," he reportedly declared.

That statement, according to government intelligence sources, was made to the 40 Committee, a five-man group so secret that its existence was unknown at the time to the vast majority of Congress, the press, and even the White House staff.

Kissinger, through a State Department spokesman, said he could not recall making the statement but, in any case, could not comment on 40 Committee activities.

The 40 Committee is elected by no one, and responsible to no one except the President, who appoints its members.

Serious students of foreign-policy-making have questioned whether, in a democracy, such a five-man directorate should have this kind of unbridled power, whether the five are really in touch with American public opin-

ion, and whether Congress should not have tighter reins on their covert programs.

As a consequence of the 40 Committee's action however, large sums of Central Intelligence Agency money were poured vainly into Chile to avert the election of leftist Salvador Allende. And that money was followed in later years by even larger sums to "destabilize" the Chilean economy and topple the Allende regime.

With the Chilean military uprising in 1973 and Allende's violent death, the policy ultimately succeeded.

But it has produced in recent days several developments certain to provoke a new national debate on the role of the CIA and even of Kissinger himself. It has:

—Focused attention, at last, on the 40 Committee, dominated by military and intelligence professionals of the World War II-Cold War vintage, as the real overseer, even operator, of the CIA's covert activities and responsible only to the President.

—Made clear the emergence of Kissinger as the most powerful non-elected official in the nation's history, standing astride the intelligence, covert-operations and foreign-policy apparatuses as Secretary of State, chairman of the National Security Council, National Security Adviser to the President and Chairman of the 40 Committee.

—Destroyed what was left of the belief that at least a few members of Congress have knowledge of and a veto over the cloak-and-dagger aspects of CIA.

"The CIA is the tool of the President and it works today for Kissinger," according to one government source.

The history of the U.S. government's Chilean adventure dates back to 1964 when Allende, a proclaimed Marxist, first sought the presidency. CIA funds helped his Christian Democratic opponent, Eduardo Frei, capture the presidency that year.

GREATER DANGER SEEN BY WASHINGTON

But by 1970, Frei could not succeed himself and the Allende threat was seen by Washington as greater than ever. This time even more money was funneled by CIA into anti-Allende efforts.

In all, according to secret testimony April 22 this year by CIA Director William Colby, as revealed by Rep. Michael J. Harrington (D-Mass.), the agency pumped \$11 million into anti-Allende efforts in Chile between 1964 and 1973. It was spent as follows:

—\$3 million went in 1964 to help finance the Christian Democratic Party, Allende's chief opposition.

—About \$500,000 was advanced in 1969 to help Chilean individuals and organizations gear up to oppose Allende the next year.

—Another \$500,000 went to opposition party personnel during the 1970 campaign, and \$350,000 was authorized to bribe the Chilean congress, but this last effort was abandoned.

—Following Allende's election, \$5 million was authorized to disrupt the Chilean economy from 1971 to 1973, and \$1.5 million more was spent to influence Chilean municipal elections in 1973. Some of these funds helped finance an influential Chilean newspaper.

—Finally, in August, 1973, just one month before Allende's downfall, another \$1 million was authorized to press home the effort to wreck the Chilean economy, already in trouble because of Allende's own misguided policies.

In each case, the effort and the expenditure were approved by the 40 Committee, or by the same committee operating under another alias, such as the 303 Committee.

"No more mysterious group exists within the government than the 40 Committee," according to David Wise, a journalist who has long been a student of the American intelligence community.

"Its operations are so secret that in an appearance before the Senate Armed Services

Committee, CIA Director Colby was even reluctant to identify the chairman," he said.

The Bay of Pigs invasion attempt, the U-2 overflights of Russia, the overthrow of the Arbenz government in Guatemala—each of these was a CIA covert operation approved by the 40 Committee, or its predecessors.

In most cases, it now appears, Congress was kept in the dark, at least until after the operations were completed, and sometimes beyond that.

The Chilean intervention is an example of how this blindfolding of Congress works.

On March 29 this year, Charles A. Meyers, former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, told a Senate subcommittee that "the policy of the government . . . was that there would be no intervention in the political affairs of Chile . . . we financed no candidates, no political parties . . ."

As late as June 12 of this year—two months after Colby's secret admission—Harry Schlaudeman, number two man in the American embassy in Chile from 1969-73, denied that any such U.S. effort was made.

"There was no funding, of that I am quite sure," Schlaudeman told a closed hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

CIA Director Colby emphasizes when questioned that the agency makes full secret reports to the "appropriate" Congressional committees, the so-called CIA "oversight" subcommittees of the House and Senate.

But what they are told, according to a former top official of CIA, depends on what questions they ask—and frequently they don't ask the right questions.

"The CIA deals with Congress in the way that Congress requests it to," said the official, who requested anonymity. "Often they don't ask the right questions. But it's their fault."

Among the subjects that have escaped close congressional questioning have been the operations of the 40 Committee.

Despite its anonymity, the committee appears to have existed under one name or another since at least 1954.

It was apparently formed officially in 1954 as the Special Group and later called the 54-12 Committee. In President Kennedy's time, it operated under the name 303 Committee, apparently a reference to the room it used in the Executive Office Building adjoining the White House.

The names, in each case, have been deliberately designed to provide no clue as to its function. Its members communicate mostly by word of mouth, with little paperwork and a staff of one man, believed to be a CIA employee.

"You can look all you want but you won't find any document with the title '40 Committee' on it," said one former intelligence officer. "It's like, officially at least, it didn't exist."

From its pre-1954 origins as a loose group of top State and Defense Department officials, the group has evolved a fixed membership based on title and formalized in a directive of the National Security Council. The name 40 Committee is believed to refer to an NSC directive number 40.

Kissinger, as national security adviser to the President, took charge of the 40 committee under former President Nixon and retains the chairmanship today.

The other members are Air Force Gen. George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; William P. Clements Jr., deputy Secretary of Defense; Joseph J. Sisco, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Colby, the CIA director.

They are men in their 50s, veterans of World War II and the Cold War periods.

Colby's membership, according to critics, is the classic story of the "fox in the hen coop"—the CIA director, in effect, sitting in judgment on plans and proposals of his own agency.

October 11, 1974

E 6465

request was \$28.5 million—the same amount was provided in fiscal year 1974. In a letter to Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I urged the restoration of funding of NDEA title III to, at the very least, the fiscal year 1974 level. I was therefore very pleased to learn that the committee did in fact restore this necessary funding.

It is my sincere hope that when the Senate resumes consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill after the elections, it will approve the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee with respect to NDEA, title III.

ABORTION DEMAND

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the most single important legislative business awaiting action before the close of the 93d Congress is the passage of legislation to correct the damage that has been done to the moral fabric of our society as a result of the disastrous decision of February 1973, which permits abortion on demand.

This is an issue that is essential to the whole range and freedoms and responsibilities embodied in the U.S. Constitution. The right to life is the starting point of all other rights. If the right to life is absolute, Government cannot rightfully diminish or restrict this right.

In the 14th amendment, the Constitution guarantees that:

No State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

In *Roe against Wade*, the Supreme Court decided that some human beings were not "persons" within the meaning of the 14th amendment. The Court held that the unborn infant can be defined as a nonperson and subjected to death at the convenience of others or because others consider him unfit to live.

I believe that the great majority of Americans believe this Court opinion violates fundamental moral and spiritual principles. I share this conviction. Life starts at the moment of conception and the sacred spark should be protected from that moment onward. It is indefensible to withhold protection from human beings, however young.

Legislative action is necessary, not only to protect the young, but also the elderly, sick and retarded who are also now in peril of being defined as nonpersons by the Supreme Court. In principle these persons too are capable of being defined as not self-sustaining.

It is essential to reverse the Supreme Court on its basic proposition. During this Congress, the House of Representatives has attached numerous amendments to many different pieces of legislation which prohibits the use of Federal money to perform abortions. I have been

pleased to support the passage of these amendments, but we must recognize that they do not go far enough. A constitutional amendment is needed which would protect the right of life from the very beginning and would guarantee the equal protection of the laws to all human beings at every moment of existence.

Several resolutions are pending within the House Judiciary Committee which seek a basic reversal of the new Supreme Court policy. The committee should act soon to recommend one of these measures to the floor where it can be swiftly passed and sent to the Senate. We should delay no longer in proposing a human life amendment to the Constitution which can be ratified by a vote of the State legislatures.

A CRUCIAN COMMENT ON "MR. ADAM"

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, on October 2, I inserted an article on Mr. Adam Petersen, whom we in the Virgin Islands look upon as a living example of our Virgin Islands culture "in motion."

Today, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention a similar article on "Mr. Adam" written by Mr. Charles Hawes, a local columnist—a well-known artist, himself—writing for the *St. Croix Avis*, a newspaper which has been serving the Virgin Islands since 1844. Charlie Hawes had this to say:

The article is as follows:

CRUCIAN COMMENT

(By Charles Hawes)

Every so often, if you're lucky and the moon is in the right quarter, you reach a personal pinnacle of sorts. Just such a thing recently happened to us. It's not the kind of thing money can buy. You just have to be standing in the right place at the right time, and there it is.

Mr. Leroy Daniel drove into our yard not long ago to approach us about doing a painting of a Mr. Adam Petersen who lived at the Herbert Griggs Home. As president of the St. Croix Cultural Dancers, Inc., a non-profit organization founded by Mrs. Lillian Bailey, Mr. Daniel informed us that Mr. Adam Petersen was the foremost floor-master of quadrille in the Virgin Islands, and that his organization wished to present Mr. Adam the painting at a testimonial ceremony on the night of September 20.

Now with the possible exception of musicians, there is no group of people in the world who get as much fun out of their work as artists. Adam Petersen turned out to be a giant of a man. Badly injured a number of years ago, he is a polished ebony carving, walking with a cane. A totally bald head sits squarely on his massive shoulders, and the deep-set eyes that peer from beneath heavy brows cannot suppress a smiling twinkle that says he knows something that you don't know. Square-jawed, his mouth is an upturned smiling slash until he opens it widely to shout a call to his performing dancers. We painted him holding a guitar with a suggestion of a quadrille in the background. We would like to paint him a hundred times.

So the time came and Mr. Adam Petersen was honored at St. Gerard's Hall. Hundreds of friends were there to wish him well. He was honored, in the words of the Hon. Hortense Rowe, Commissioner of Conservation and Cultural Affairs (would someone mind shortening that?) the keynote speaker, "for your contributions to the performing arts, and for the preservation of the cultural heritage of the people of St. Croix." The Governor and his Lady were there. The President of the Senate was there, as well as our Congressional Representative, Ron de Lugo. Joining the Hon. Gwendolyn Blake, Commissioner of Social Welfare, in saying a few words, was Mrs. Dolores Brewster, head nurse at the Herbert Griggs Home. Pinch-hitting for his brother Randall James as toastmaster was old friend, Luz back among us and going strong.

Thus it was fitting that the St. Croix Cultural Dancers should perform before the master on his night of nights. This they did in perfection and grace, though twice called to task by the master by shrill blasts on the whistle for no fault apparent to this neophyte. They executed the Seven Steps and then that most difficult of all forms, The Lancers, to tumultuous and deserved applause.

It was somewhere here in between the raising of our glass of real Crucian guava berry and Mr. Adam's whistling halt at the end of number four of The Lancers that we found ourselves on this pinnacle we started this column talking about. There we sat at a table with the highest officials in this adopted home of ours, Mr. Adam, five feet to our left, calling to his dancers, our old friend Stanley Jacobs ten feet behind us blasting us right out of the room, and we were higher than any riches can buy.

So to close once more on a note about electronic amplification; if we have to be blown right out of a room, let it be by Stanley Jacobs and The Sleepless Nights.

God bless you, Mr. Adam. It was we who were honored.

THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, October 10, marks the 63d anniversary of the Republic of China. It is both an honor and a pleasure to join with so many of my colleagues in sending President Chiang Kai-shek and the people of the Republic of China our sincere congratulations.

Many people in the world seem to think that the future of the Republic of China is uncertain. The free Chinese, however, are anything but uncertain of their own destiny.

The Republic of China not only has taken its recent diplomatic reverses in stride, but is engaged in an unprecedented program of social, industrial, and economic expansion.

As citizens of "the only one of the world's developing nations to have truly developed," the people of the Republic of China now enjoy the second highest standard of living in Asia, a per capita income that is five times that of the people on the Chinese mainland, and a stable economy whose gross national product has risen at a real rate of over

October 11, 1974

E 6467

At times, other officials have sat in; John Mitchell, as Mr. Nixon's Attorney General, was a 40 Committee member and there is some dispute over whether the late Robert Kennedy in his turn as Attorney General, also was a member. It is believed that Mr. Nixon's controversial assistants, H. R. Halde- man and John Ehrlichman, also attended meetings, but evidently not as members.

Each 40 Committee, according to past and present intelligence officers, has tended to become an extension of the chairman, chiefly because he alone has access directly to the President.

Kissinger has come to dominate the 40 Committee far beyond the power of his predecessor and to an extent some intelligence specialists here believe is dangerous.

In the past, for example, the 40 Committee met weekly, but not today.

As his own responsibilities have expanded, Kissinger has convened the committee less frequently, intelligence specialists here say. Much of the time, according to several sources, Kissinger merely confers with the other members by telephone, dealing with them individually rather than as a group, and passing on to the President the consensus that he alone has had a real hand in fashioning.

The result, according to specialists who have served in both the CIA and State Department, has been to concentrate decision-making in fewer hands, mostly Kissinger's hands.

"A lot of the consultation and argumentation that went on is missing now," said one official.

The controversy over Kissinger's role extends to the Chilean adventure and who really initiated it.

The CIA clearly has taken most of the heat to date, but at least one official highly placed in the State Department from 1970 to 1973, the years of the most ambitious anti-Allende effort, believes the "CIA may be getting a bum rap."

The idea for intervention, he said, appears to have come from the White House—"from Nixon or Kissinger."

It was then farmed out to CIA to develop a plan and provide funds and routed routinely back to the 40 Committee, where Kissinger, as 40 Committee chairman, approved what may have been his own plan, this source said.

According to this official, the CIA "was not that hot" for intervention.

The State Department was divided, he said. Edward Korry, then ambassador to Chile, appeared to favor some CIA role, but the State Department's own Intelligence and Research experts opposed the idea, not on moral grounds, but in the belief it would not work and was too risky.

It is not known, he said, how U. Alexis Johnson, then as under Secretary in the State Department's man on the 40 Committee, "played it in the committee." But in any event, Kissinger's view would have been irresistible because of his influence with the President, he added.

There are some intelligence specialists here who credit Kissinger with having imposed some restraint on CIA after a decade in which the White House and the 40 Committee stood in awe of the agency's glamorous "dirty tricks" department.

This was particularly true under President Johnson's hawkish National Security Adviser, Walt Rostow, of whom one ex-State department intelligence officer said, "he scared even the CIA."

But at the same time, there is apprehension among the same sources that Kissinger has compounded what many saw all along as a real shortcoming of the 40 Committee operation—the concentration of a review function in the hands of men already busy with daily operating responsibilities in their own fields.

The agenda of the 40 Committee includes some of the most delicate foreign-policy de-

isions of the United States government. Besides the CIA's covert projects, it also reviews and approves monthly a Joint Reconnaissance Schedule that involves, among other things, the use of spy satellites around the world.

Outside the intelligence community there is criticism of the secrecy which shrouds the CIA and hands over its operations to a non-elected elite such as the 40 Committee. But within the intelligence community here—men sympathetic to the need for clandestine policy alternatives in a divided world—the concern is that there is not enough control of CIA by institutions such as the 40 Committee.

For example, Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, former U.S. intelligence officers and authors of "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence," maintain that covert operations account for only \$440 million of CIA's estimated budget of more than \$750 million a year. The actual figures are a closely held secret.

By far the larger, more important operation—world-wide espionage—is subject to no review by the 40 Committee.

This is true even if the espionage involves as sensitive an operation as hiring a key official of a foreign government—as has been done in Latin America at the risk of a serious diplomatic incident.

SOME RESULTS NEVER ENVISIONED

Even covert operations approved by the 40 Committee have some history of generating capers never envisioned by the Committee. The Russian sugar case is an example.

Directed by the 40 Committee to do its damnest to foul up the Cuban economy, CIA agents picked on a load of Cuban sugar bound for Russia that had been off-loaded in an American port. They contaminated the sugar, risking a real ruckus with the Russians.

The deed was undone only when President Kennedy learned of it in time.

With the growth of multi-national corporations—the spread of American business abroad in the 1960s—the chance for unmonitored CIA mischief has expanded mightily. For many of these businesses, the CIA is fertile recruiting ground, and the list of American banks and international business is replete with ex-CIA employees whose old loyalties can be tapped by the agency.

According to one published report, Colby has said the CIA maintains some 200 agents abroad posing as businessmen.

With the disclosure of its role in Chile, there are signs at last that Congress, which has closed its eyes to the ever-widening CIA role, may be about to take a tougher line.

Sen. Frank Church (D-Ida), chairman of a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on multi-national corporations, is exploring the possibility of perjury prosecutions against Administration officials who denied any U.S. effort to topple Allende.

And even Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), a member of the Senate's CIA oversight subcommittee and supposedly one of the few men in Congress informed about the agency, expressed surprise at Colby's admission of the depth of CIA intrusion into Chile.

Among Congress's younger members, like Harrington, there is a rising cry for more control of the agency.

What form that might take is not yet clear. But many intelligence specialists questioned here felt that the CIA might well have to surrender some of its covert operations to protect its more vital intelligence gathering and evaluation capability.

Colby seemed to suggest that late Friday, when, at a conference here on "CIA and Covert Activities," he declared that an end to covert activities "would not have a major effect on the current security of the United States."

In fact, according to Ray S. Cline, a former CIA deputy director, covert activity is on the

decline, and has been since its hey-day in the 1950s and 1960s. The thawing of the Cold War, and the detente in general have made the difference, he said.

"COLD WARRIOR" STARTED IT ALL

The man who started it all was that first Cold Warrior, Harry S. Truman, who put together the CIA in 1947, primarily as an intelligence-gathering agency, and saw it quickly enter the cloak-and-dagger trade.

At the end, it seems, Mr. Truman had some second thoughts, and it may be that Congress, will take its lead from this comment attributed to the former President in 1963:

"I never had any thought when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations. Some of the complications and embarrassment that I think we have experienced are in part attributable to the fact that this quiet intelligence arm of the President has been so removed from its intended role . . .

"I would like to see the CIA restored to its original assignment as the intelligence arm of the President and whatever else it can properly perform in that special field and its operational duties be terminated or properly used elsewhere.

"We have grown up as a nation respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position, and I feel that we need to correct it."

DENNIS SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week I had the personal pleasure of attending the ceremonies admitting my daughter, Martha Ellen Dennis, to the Bar of the State of Indiana.

Consequently, I was absent from the House Chamber during the calling of the roll on final passage of House Resolution 988, the committee reform amendments, and on H.R. 16901, the agriculture, environment and consumer protection appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of passage of both of these important measures.

House Resolution 988 represents the first major undertaking by the House in the last 25 years to review and reform its committee system. Had I been present, I would have voted for the Bolling resolution rather than for the HANSEN substitute, although I would hope to have amended the BOLLING resolution—as I did the MARTIN resolution—to provide that the Panama Canal not be placed under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, in this one particular, I preferred the HANSEN version. However, this measure, even the HANSEN substitutive proposal which prevailed, represents a step toward reform of the House committee system.

As to H.R. 16901 I voted for the previous bill when it first passed the House, and later voted to sustain the President's veto, after the Senate increased the

appropriation. The present new bill is some \$192 million less than the measure which was vetoed, and I support the present legislation.

OPPOSITION TO TAX SURCHARGE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are, there always have been, and there probably always will be those in government whose immediate answer to any fiscal problem is more taxation of American business and the American people. I know that President Ford believes his recommendation of a 5 percent surcharge will be effective in fighting inflation. While I fully expect to support the President of the United States on every possible occasion, in this case I must respectfully disagree.

The President has proposed a 5-percent surcharge on corporate and individual incomes above a certain level. It is estimated that this surcharge will bring an additional \$2.6 billion into the Treasury. Unfortunately, since this is a surcharge, those millionaires who somehow seem to escape income taxes will also escape this tax, and the burden will fall on the same taxpayers always hit.

And what happens to this money? It will be spent by the Federal Government—pumped back into an already inflation-ridden economy to further fuel the inflationary spiral. America's taxpayers, however, will be even less able to cope with higher prices because their incomes will be further reduced by the 5-percent surcharge.

The \$2.6 billion is not a large sum, compared with an overall Federal budget topping more than \$300 billion. It is less than 1 percent of the budget. In fact, but it would be a far more effective approach to simply reduce the budget by that same 1 percent—and more, preferably to a balanced budget where spending will no longer exceed income. Such a reduction in Federal spending, to effect a balanced budget, would have a very dramatic effect on inflation. If we define inflation as too many dollars chasing too few goods and services, then it makes sense to have fewer Federal dollars chasing these goods and services and driving up their prices.

As I said on the floor following President Ford's first speech to a joint session of Congress, I support him in his fight against inflation. I want to support my President on every possible occasion, and work with him for the betterment of our Nation. But I must respectfully disagree with this proposal to increase income taxes. Such tax increases have not cured inflation in the past, and will not cure inflation now.

More taxation is not the answer to inflation. It just pinches the budgets of American households even more. The budget which needs to be pinched is the Federal budget. It contains the fat, the waste, the unnecessary expenditures, the outmoded programs, the unjustifiable

policies. Let us clean up our own accounts before we put a lien on the income of others.

Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget is essential, and I will continually strive to achieve that goal—not by increasing taxes, but by decreasing government spending. For too long the Federal Government has been robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is past time for us to get our financial house in order. If we can achieve this, we will finally be getting rid of one of the major underlying causes of our inflation.

THE NEW TOWN AS AN INSTRUMENT OF SOCIAL CHANGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently at the Black Arts Festival at Reston, Va., Mr. Floyd B. McKissick gave a speech on the new town—intown concept as a mechanism for social change. He envisioned the new town concept as a major instrument and strategy for blacks to integrate the economic and political realms of this society.

The new town principle is a reliable alternative to the deprivation and poverty in our cities and rural areas.

I would like to share with my colleagues Mr. McKissick's speech:

THE NEW TOWN AS AN INSTRUMENT OF SOCIAL CHANGE

(A speech delivered by Mr. Floyd B. McKissick to the Reston Black Arts Festival at Reston, Va. on August 31, 1974.)

(Mr. McKissick is the developer of the Soul City new town and president of the Soul City Co.)

I am delighted to be present at the 1974 Reston Black Focus Arts Festival, and honored to have been chosen to give the luncheon address. I am again delighted to meet with so many New Town associates. New Town people are a peculiar species of humans who believe that society is a mixture of people and of bricks and mortar. They believe that the economic process combined with people, bricks and mortar can improve society as a whole and can provide solutions for individual people of all varieties.

It is time to ask, however, "what is a new town, a new community?" It has recently become a popular expression, not at times expressing what "real" new town developers are all about. Many new housing projects are described erroneously as new communities. How a developer defines what a new community is, depends in part upon the developer himself—his background—his experience—his concept of life—his concept of humanity—his love for people—his love for his country, and his desire for a better world where people can live with dignity because of their color and their cultural distinctiveness, and be loved and be respected by all. A new town is not just bricks and mortar, nor sticks and stones, but a new town must be built by people and a new town must have soul.

New communities are reactions to the many problems of American Society, thereby creating bold alternatives to urban sprawl and mass out-migration from rural depressed areas. New towns are the result of combined initiative of the Federal Government, private

financing, private developers and concerned citizens. This initiative requires that the inter-dynamics of social, cultural, physical and economic systems must be a part of the development plan of new communities.

Let us now look at how the concept of a new town can be broadened to deal with the basic problems confronting the American society today. Let's make a list of the problems that face America today, those problems which have, to a degree, polarized the races: unemployment and underemployment—lack of economic opportunities—poor health services—lack of police protection—racism—discrimination against women, the elderly and the young—crime in the streets—an inequitable welfare system—poor housing—poor transportation—the lack of new concepts in religion—education—politics—pollution.

Let me make my position on one thing emphatically clear. I am an integrationist. I believe that the struggle of the 1960's has not been stopped in spite of the deaths of my great friends, Martin Luther King, Whitney Young, John F. Kennedy, Malcolm X, Robert Kennedy and Lyndon Baines Johnson, and the many other known and lesser known men and women.

The problem is that we have never experienced, and are not now living in a fully integrated society. We have not tried real integration yet.

Two of the most basic areas in society are today almost completely segregated—one is our economic system, that is, Wall Street and the ownership and management of production. The second is our political system. Both systems are highly sophisticated and cannot be integrated by mere protest or by marching in the streets singing freedom songs. The struggle to integrate the economic and political realms of this society depends upon knowledge—skills—endurance—and sagacity, and in many instances it requires the subordination of the ego. That is why there is a distinction between the strategy employed in the battle to fight overt segregation in the 1960's and the strategy to fight subtle racism of the 1970's. Our objectives have not changed. It is the strategy to accomplish those same objectives that pierced the American conscience in the 1960's that has changed. The end is the same, only the means has been changed.

Unfortunately, many do not realize that the new community is a concept for combating the ills which confront society and is a mechanism for continuing the struggle of the 1960's. Many do not realize that while we continue the struggle—that the struggle must be shifted to urban development and at the same time must be maintained in the rural community. New communities can be built by private financing and new communities can be models for existing distressed urban and rural areas.

The preamble to the "Urban Growth and New Community Development Act"—(Section 701) states: "It is the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this title to provide for the development of a national urban growth policy and to encourage the rational, orderly, efficient, and economic growth, development, and redevelopment of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, towns, and communities in predominantly rural areas which demonstrate a special potential for accelerated growth; to encourage the prudent use and conservation of our natural resources; and to encourage and support development which will assure our communities of adequate tax bases, community services, job opportunities, and well-balanced neighborhoods in socially, economically, and physically attractive living environments."

This New Community Act was first passed by the Congress in 1968. Under Title VII, as we lawyers like to call it, more than a dozen new towns are now being built across America. Soul City is one of these. Yet neither

1 (1) nine members of the House of Representatives,
2 of whom—

3 (A) five shall be appointed by the House
4 majority leader, and to include one member from
5 the Committee on Armed Services, one from the
6 Committee on Foreign Affairs, and one from the
7 Committee on Appropriations; and

8 (B) four shall be appointed by the House
9 minority leader, to include one from each of the
10 above named standing committees; and

11 (2) nine members of the Senate, of whom—

12 (A) five shall be appointed by the Senate
13 majority leader, and to include one member from
14 the Committee on Armed Services, one from the
15 Committee on Foreign Relations, and one from the
16 Committee on Appropriations; and

17 (B) four to be appointed by the Senate minor-
18 ity leader, to include one from each of the above
19 named standing committees.

20 (b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a
21 vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of
22 each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and
23 stead of the chairman in his absence. The chairmanship and
24 vice chairmanship shall alternate between the House of Rep-
25 resentatives and the Senate with each Congress. The chair-

1 man during each even-numbered Congress shall be selected
2 by the Members of the House of Representatives on the joint
3 committee from among their number and the chairman during
4 each odd-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Mem-
5 bers of the Senate on the joint committee from among their
6 number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be
7 chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress
8 other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is
9 a Member.

10 (c) A majority of the members of the joint committee
11 shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, ex-
12 cept that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a
13 quorum for the purpose of taking testimony. Vacancies in
14 the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the
15 power of the remaining members to execute the functions
16 of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner
17 as specified in, and in conformance with, subsection (a).

18 DUTIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

19 SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee
20 to conduct continuing oversight of, and to exercise exclusive
21 jurisdiction over, the legislative authorization with respect
22 to the foreign intelligence activities and operations of (1)
23 the Central Intelligence Agency, (2) the Defense Intelli-
24 gence Agency, Department of Defense, (3) the National
25 Security Agency, (4) the Bureau of Intelligence and Re-

1 search, Department of State, (5) Army, Navy, and Air
2 Force Intelligence, and (6) other agencies, bureaus, or
3 departments insofar as their operations include foreign in-
4 telligence activities.

5 (b) The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency,
6 the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Direc-
7 tor of the National Security Agency, the Director of the
8 Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the Commander of
9 United States Army Intelligence, the Commander of Naval
10 Intelligence, and the Air Force Deputy Assistant Chief of
11 Staff for Intelligence shall keep the joint committee fully
12 and currently informed with respect to all of the foreign
13 intelligence activities and operations of their respective
14 organizations, and the heads of all other departments and
15 agencies of the Federal Government conducting foreign in-
16 telligence activities and operations shall keep the joint
17 committee fully and currently informed of all foreign in-
18 telligence activities and operations carried out by their re-
19 spective departments and agencies. The joint committee
20 shall have authority to require from any department or
21 agency of the Federal Government periodic reports regard-
22 ing activities and operations within the jurisdiction of the
23 joint committee.

24 (c) (1) All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the
25 House of Representatives or the Senate relating primarily to

1 the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense
2 Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the
3 Bureau of Intelligence and Research, or Army, Navy, and
4 Air Force Intelligence, or to foreign intelligence activities or
5 operations of any other department or agency of the Federal
6 Government shall be referred to the joint committee. Nothing
7 in this subsection shall be construed to deprive any committee
8 of either House from exercising legislative oversight with
9 respect to foreign intelligence activities and operations related
10 to the jurisdiction of such committee.

11 (2) Members of the joint committee who are Members
12 of the House of Representatives shall from time to time
13 report to the House, and Members of the Senate shall from
14 time to time report to the Senate, by bill or otherwise, their
15 recommendations with respect to matters which are within
16 the jurisdiction of their respective Houses and which are
17 referred to the joint committee or are otherwise within the
18 jurisdiction of the joint committee.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS

20 SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee
21 thereof, is authorized, in its discretion, to make expenditures;
22 to employ personnel; to adopt rules respecting its organiza-
23 tion and procedures; to hold hearings; to sit and act at any
24 time or place; to subpoena witnesses and documents; with

1 the prior consent of the Federal department or agency con-
2 cerned, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of person-
3 nel, information, and facilities of any such department or
4 agency; to procure printing and binding services; to pro-
5 cure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or
6 intermittent services of individual consultants, or organiza-
7 tions thereof, and to provide assistance for the training of
8 its professional staff, in the same manner and under the same
9 conditions as a standing committee of the Senate may pro-
10 cure such services and provide such assistance under sub-
11 sections (i) and (j), respectively, of section 202 of the Leg-
12 islative Reorganization Act of 1946; and to take depositions
13 and other testimony.

14 (b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the
15 chairman of the joint committee or by any member desig-
16 nated by him or the joint committee, and may be served
17 by such person as may be designated by such chairman or
18 member. The chairman of the joint committee or any mem-
19 ber thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The pro-
20 visions of sections 102 to 104 of the Revised Statutes (2
21 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of
22 any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when
23 summoned under authority of this subsection.

1 CLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION

2 SEC. 5. (a) The joint committee shall be charged with
3 the establishment of guidelines for the classification of in-
4 formation originating within the joint committee in accord-
5 ance with standards used generally by the executive branch
6 for classifying restricted data or defense information.

7 (b) The joint committee shall be charged with the
8 establishment of guidelines under which its data and records
9 shall be maintained and be made available to (1) any
10 Member of Congress who requests such records or data or
11 (2) any officer or employee of the House of Representatives
12 or the Senate who has been designated by a Member of Con-
13 gress to have access to such records and data and who has
14 the appropriate security clearance to have such access.

15 RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

16 SEC. 6. The joint committee shall keep a complete record
17 of all joint committee actions, including a record of the
18 votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.
19 All records, data, charts, and files of the joint committee shall
20 be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in
21 the offices of the joint committee or such other places as the
22 joint committee may direct.

1 EXPENSES OF JOINT COMMITTEE

2 SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid
3 from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appro-
4 priated for the joint committee, upon vouchers signed by the
5 chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the
6 joint committee authorized by the chairman.

93^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 17256

A BILL

To create a Joint Committee on Intelligence
Operations.

By Mr. BROSTER

OCTOBER 10, 1974

Referred to the Committee on Rules